



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/580,848

04/05/2007

Naoto Okino

09812.0084

5005

22852

7590

09/13/2010

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

KESSLER, GREGORY AARON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2195

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/13/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/580,848	Applicant(s) OKINO ET AL.	
	Examiner GREGORY A. KESSLER	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/26/2006, 06/30/2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - In Paragraph [0001], Line 6, “an main” is unclear.
 - In Paragraph [0001], Line 7, and multiple other locations throughout the specification (Paragraph [0002], Line 2, Paragraph [0003], Line 1, and many others), “OS’s” should be in plural form and not possessive form.
 - In Paragraph [0002], Line 1, “multi operating” should be “multi-operating”.
 - In Paragraph [0004], Line 2, “multi OS” should be “multi-OS”.
 - In Paragraph [0006], Line 5, "time sharing" should be "time-sharing".
 - In Paragraph [0007], Lines 4-5, "the processor cannot be used by the other processor" is unclear.
 - In Paragraph [0008], Line 3, “an main” is unclear.
 - In Paragraph [0009], Line 6, “interrupt enabled” should be “interrupt-enabled” and "interrupt disabled" should be "interrupt-disabled".
 - In Paragraph [0010], Lines 6-7, “interrupt enabled” should be “interrupt-enabled” and "interrupt disabled" should be "interrupt-disabled".

Art Unit: 2195

- In Paragraph [0011], Line 5, “interrupt enabled” should be “interrupt-enabled” and “interrupt disabled” should be “interrupt-disabled”.
- In Paragraph [0013], Line 8, “interrupt disabled” should be “interrupt-disabled”.
- In Paragraph [0013], Line 12, “interrupt enabled” should be “interrupt-enabled”.
- In Paragraph [0013], Line 18, “high priority” should be “high-priority”.
- In Paragraph [0013], Line 20, “low priority” should be “low-priority”.
- In Paragraph [0014], Line 15, “high priority” should be “high-priority”.
- In Paragraph [0014], Line 17, “low priority” should be “low-priority”.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in “full, clear, concise, and exact terms.” The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are shown above under heading number two.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In multiple cases, “interrupt enabled” should be “interrupt-enabled”.
- In multiple cases, “interrupt disabled” should be “interrupt-disabled”.

Art Unit: 2195

- In multiple cases, “sub operating system” should be “sub-operating system”.
- In claim 7, line 16, “other than an main operating system” is unclear.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The claim language of the following claims is not clearly understood:

- i. As to claim 1, line 15, claim 7, line 18, and claim 13, line 18, it is unclear what it means for an operating system to be in an "interrupt enabled state" or an "interrupt disabled state". For purposes of this action, it is assumed to mean that the operating system is either accepting interrupts (enabled) or ignoring them (disabled).
- ii. As to claim 1, lines 18-19, claim 7, lines 22-23, and claim 13, lines 22-23, it is unclear what is “based on the status information”. Is it the controlling of an interrupt process or the generation of the interrupt that is based on the status information?

Art Unit: 2195

iii. As to claim 5, line 22 and claim 11, line 22, it is unclear whether the “or” in the claims means that (a) is done as either (a1) or (a2) and (b) is done separately or if (a) is done as either (a1) or ((a2) and (b)). For purposes of this action, it is assumed that (a) is done as either (a1) or ((a2) and (b)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As to claim 1, the claimed invention is directed to an apparatus, but appears to be comprised of software alone without claiming associated computer hardware required for execution. The operating systems are never expressly defined as physical elements and can therefore be just a piece of code. Software alone is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As to claims 2-6, they do not cure the deficiencies of the claim on which they depend. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons.

10. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. As to claim 7, the claim recites a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to

Art Unit: 2195

particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385.

The instant claim is neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore, does not qualify as a statutory process. As to claims 8-12, they do not cure the deficiencies of the claim on which they depend. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons.

11. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention is directed to an computer program and appears to be comprised of software alone without claiming associated computer hardware required for execution. Software alone is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Art Unit: 2195

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England et al (**U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0230794 A1, hereinafter England**) in view of Nota et al (**U.S. Pat. No. 5805790, hereinafter Nota**).

Nota was cited in the IDS dated 05/26/2006.

15. As per claim 1, England teaches the limitations substantially as claimed, including an information processing apparatus for processing data, the information processing apparatus comprising:

a plurality of operating systems (Abstract, Lines 1-2), the plurality of operating systems including a main operating system controlling an interrupt process (Paragraph [0119], Lines 1-8) and a sub operating system (Abstract, Lines 1-4), the main operating system, along with a system control operating system set as the sub operating system, setting a logical partition as a process unit, and managing a hardware resource relating to the logical partition (Paragraph [0007], Lines 1-8), the sub operating system operating within the logical partition set by the main operating system and the system control operating system (Paragraph [0007], Lines 1-8), and executing a software application program with the hardware resource assigned to the logical partition (Paragraph [0086],

Art Unit: 2195

Lines 1-6), and the main operating system controlling the interrupt process to perform one of an interrupt process execution and an interrupt process reserve (Paragraph [0119], Lines 1-8).

England does not expressly teach the main operating system storing status information as to whether the sub operating system is in an interrupt enabled state or an interrupt disabled state and that the controlling of the interrupt process is done in response to the generation of the interrupt based on the status information.

However, Nota teaches the main operating system storing status information as to whether the sub operating system is in an interrupt enabled state or an interrupt disabled state and that the controlling of the interrupt process is done in response to the generation of the interrupt based on the status information (Figure 2; Figure 14; Col. 15, Lines 44-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Nota with those of England in order to ensure that England's apparatus was aware of when an interrupt occurred in a guest operating system so that the interrupt could be handled properly.

16. As per claim 3, Nota teaches that the sub operating system notifies the main operating system of the status information as to whether the sub operating system is in

Art Unit: 2195

the interrupt enabled state or the interrupt disabled state (Col. 4, Lines 50-51), and wherein the main operating system updates the status information of the sub operating system in response to the notification from the sub operating system (Figure 2; Figure 14; Col. 15, Lines 44-50).

17. As per claim 7, it is a method claim of apparatus claim 1 with an additional limitation. Those limitations that correspond to limitations from claim 1 are rejected for the same reasons.

As to the further limitations, Nota teaches detecting the generation of an interrupt (Col. 15, Lines 39-40).

18. As per claim 9, it is a method claim of apparatus claim 3. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons.

19. As per claim 13, it is a computer program claim of apparatus claim 1 with an additional limitation. Those limitations that correspond to limitations from claim 1 are rejected for the same reasons.

As to the further limitations, Nota teaches detecting the generation of an interrupt (Col. 15, Lines 39-40).

Art Unit: 2195

20. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England and Nota, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brelsford et al (**U.S. Pat. No. 4674038, hereinafter Brelsford**).

21. As per claim 2, Nota teaches that the main operating system stores interrupt process status information (Figure 2; Figure 14; Col. 15, Lines 44-50) and resumes the interrupt process execution in response to the transition of the sub operating system between the interrupt enabled state and the interrupt disabled state (Col. 16, Lines 35-40).

England and Nota do not expressly teach that the status information includes information as to whether the interrupt process is in progress or in reserve.

However, Brelsford teaches that the status information includes information as to whether the interrupt process is in progress or in reserve (Col. 2, Lines 42-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Brelsford with those of England and Nota in order to ensure that England's and Nota's main operating system had as much information as was available to use in handling interrupts in sub operating systems.

Art Unit: 2195

22. As per claim 8, it is a method claim of apparatus claim 2. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons.

23. Claims 4, 6, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England and Nota, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Balasubramanian (**U.S. Pat. No. 6633942**).

24. As per claim 4, England and Nota do not expressly teach that the main operating system stores priority information of the interrupt process, and performs the interrupt process responsive to the priority information.

However, Balasubramanian teaches that the main operating system stores priority information of the interrupt process, and performs the interrupt process responsive to the priority information (Col. 4, Lines 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Balasubramanian with those of England and Nota in order to ensure that England's and Nota's main operating system handled interrupts in an order that allowed the most important computing tasks to be completed efficiently.

25. As per claim 6, Nota teaches that the main operating system performs status management based on a status table containing the status information of the sub

Art Unit: 2195

operating system and the interrupt process status information (Figure 2; Figure 3; Figure 14; Col. 15, Lines 44-50) and England teaches that if an interrupt intended for the main operating system is generated, performs interrupt control depending on whether the operating system operating on a processor is either the main operating system or the sub operating system in a manner such that

(a) if the main operating system is in operation, the main operating system executes the interrupt process (Paragraph [0116], Lines 1-6), and that

(b) if the sub operating system is in operation, the main operating system

(b1) executes the interrupt process in response to a high priority interrupt (Paragraph [0119], Lines 1-8), or

(b2) reserves the interrupt process in response to a low priority interrupt.

England and Nota do not expressly teach priority levels of interrupts.

However, Balasubramanian teaches priority levels of interrupts (Col. 4, Lines 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Balasubramanian with those of England and Nota in order to ensure that England's and Nota's main operating system handled interrupts in an order that allowed the most important computing tasks to be completed efficiently.

Art Unit: 2195

26. As per claims 10 and 12, they are method claims of apparatus claim 4 and 6, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons.

27. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England and Nota, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brelsford, and still further in view of Tanaka et al (**U.S. Pat. No. 5499379, hereinafter Tanaka**).

28. As per claim 5, Nota teaches that the main operating system performs status management based on a status table containing the status information of the sub operating system and the interrupt process status information (Figure 2; Figure 3; Figure 14; Col. 15, Lines 44-50). England further teaches that if an interrupt intended for the sub operating system is generated and the main operating system determines based on the status table that the sub operating system is in the interrupt enabled state, performs interrupt control depending on whether the operating system operating on a processor is either the main operating system or the sub operating system in a manner such that

(a) if the main operating system is in operation, the main operating system

(a1) executes the interrupt process in response to a high priority interrupt, or

(a2) reserves the interrupt process in response to a low priority interrupt, and that

(b) if the sub operating system is in operation, the main operating system

executes the interrupt process regardless of the priority level of the interrupt (Paragraph

[0119], Lines 1-8 teaches that the main operating system executes an interrupt

Art Unit: 2195

generated for the sub operating system when the main operating system is in operation).

England and Nota do not teach that the status information includes information as to whether the interrupt process is in progress or in reserve or that if an interrupt intended for the sub operating system is generated and the main operating system determines based on the status table that the sub operating system is in the interrupt disabled state, registers the interrupt in the status table as a reserved interrupt.

However, Brelsford teaches that the status information includes information as to whether the interrupt process is in progress or in reserve (Col. 2, Lines 42-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Brelsford with those of England and Nota in order to ensure that England's and Nota's main operating system had as much information as was available to use in handling interrupts in sub operating systems.

England, Nota, and Brelsford do not teach that if an interrupt intended for the sub operating system is generated and the main operating system determines based on the status table that the sub operating system is in the interrupt disabled state, registers the interrupt in the status table as a reserved interrupt.

Art Unit: 2195

However, Tanaka teaches that that if an interrupt intended for the sub operating system is generated and the main operating system determines based on the status table that the sub operating system is in the interrupt disabled state, registers the interrupt in the status table as a reserved interrupt (Col. 19, Lines 21-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Tanaka with those of England, Nota, and Brelsford in order to allow for England's, Nota's, and Brelsford's main operating system to have greater flexibility in how to treat different interrupts, based on their individual circumstances.

29. As per claim 11, it is a method claim of apparatus claim 5. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGORY A. KESSLER whose telephone number is (571)270-7762. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., alternate Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emerson Puente can be reached on (571)272-3652. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2195

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Emerson C Puente/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

/GREGORY A KESSLER/
Examiner, Art Unit 2195